

Intervi w Summary

Application No.

09/538,024

Applicant(s)

CHATTERJEE ET AL.

Examiner

Monique R Jackson

Art Unit

1773

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Monique R Jackson.

(3) Mikhail Laskin.

(2) Sidney Persley.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 June 2001 .

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1,27 and 48 .

Identification of prior art discussed: Stevenson et al and USPN 6,011,078 .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: No agreement with regards to patentability was reached. To overcome Stevenson et al it was suggested to include a limitation with regards to a single radiation curing step .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required